

Amdt. dated July 29, 2004  
Reply to Office action of April 29, 2004

Serial No. 10/044,125  
Docket No. TUC920010054US1  
Firm No. 0018.0098

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-31 are in the case. The applicants have considered the Office Action dated April 29, 2004, and believe the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated over Demers et al. (U.S. Application No. 2002/0174142 A1, hereinafter "the Demers reference." This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is clear that the Examiner's citations to the Demers reference do not in any manner teach or suggest the present inventions as set forth in claims 1-31. For example, claim 1 is directed to a "computerized method for updating data in a database table in response to requests from a requesting application ..." comprising, *inter alia*, "receiving a request from the requesting application for specified columns from one record in the table ..." It is the Examiner's position that the Demers reference discloses a method comprising "receiving a request from the requesting application for specified columns from one record in the table (a request to update the snapshots, page5, ¶0059) ..." However, the Examiner's citation to the Demers reference does not describe a destination site such as the master site 600, receiving a request for data from the source site, such as the laptop 620. Instead, the Examiner's citation to the Demers reference makes clear that to update the snapshots 632, 634 on the laptop 620 (the source site), the "queued updates are pushed to the master site 600 [the destination site] from the locally maintained update snapshot logs." Demers reference, page 5, ¶0060. It is clear that the Examiner has cited no portion of the Demers reference which describes the destination site "receiving a request from the requesting application for specified columns from one record in the table ..." as required by claim 1.

As a further example, claim 1 is also directed to a "computerized method for updating data in a database table in response to requests from a requesting application ..." comprising, *inter alia*, "... adding to the data structure data from each column in the table that is not one of

Amdt. dated July 29, 2004  
Reply to Office action of April 29, 2004

Serial No. 10/044,125  
Docket No. TUC920010054US1  
Firm No. 0018.0098

the subset of columns if the requesting application is determined to not recognize all the columns in the table; and returning the data structure to the requesting application." It is the Examiner's position that "fig. 3b, by ignoring extra columns or filling in missing columns with default values as the case may be, page 4, ¶0043, page 5, ¶006[0]" of the Demers reference meets these claim limitations. However, these citations to the Demers reference do not describe a destination site such as the master site 600, returning a data structure to the source site, such as the laptop 620, in response to a request from the source site, laptop 620. Instead, as previously mentioned, the Demers reference makes clear that to update the snapshots 632, 634 on the laptop 620 (the source site), the "queued updates are pushed to the master site 600 [the destination site] from the locally maintained update snapshot logs." Demers reference, page 5, ¶0060.

Moreover, these citations to the Demers reference do not describe a destination site such as the master site 600, adding to a data structure to be returned to the requesting application, "data from each column in the table" as required by claim 1. Instead, as conceded by the Examiner, the Examiner's citations describe the master site 600 as merely adding "default values" to a table rather than actual values from a table. Moreover, these default values are not returned in a data structure to a requesting application as set forth above.

Thus, it is clear that the Examiner's citations to the Demers reference do not in any manner teach or suggest the present inventions as set forth in claim 1. Independent claims 10, 16, 21, 24 and 29 may be distinguished in an analogous fashion.

Claims 2-9, 11-15, 17-20, 22-23, 25-28 and 30-31 depend either directly or indirectly from one of the above independent claims. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims is improper for the reasons given above. Moreover, claims 2-9, 11-15, 17-20, 22-23, 25-28 and 30-31 include additional limitations, which in combination with the base and intervening claims from which they depend provide still further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

#### Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-31 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0449.

Amdt. dated July 29, 2004  
Reply to Office action of April 29, 2004

Serial No. 10/044,125  
Docket No. TUC920010054US1  
Firm No. 0018.0098

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: July 29, 2004

By:   
William K. Konrad  
Registration No. 28,868

Please direct all correspondences to:  
David Victor  
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP  
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210  
Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
Tel: 310-553-7977  
Fax: 310-556-7984